

***DETAILED ACTION***

The finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn, and the prosecution of this application is reopened to include new rejections raised upon further consideration.

It is noted that applicant has paid for a Notice of Appeal. Applicant can either request a refund or place the funds on credit for future appeals.

Applicant cancels claims 1, 16-17, 33-36 and adds new claims 39-40.

**Accordingly, claims 12-13, 37-40 are examined in the instant application.**

***Withdrawn Rejection***

The following rejection has been withdrawn in view of the amendment and arguments: 1) 112, first paragraph, enablement, and 2) 102 rejection.

***New Rejection after Review and Reconsideration***

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph, Written Description***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 12-13, 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the

relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification discloses that the 67 kDa laminin receptor used in the present invention is a known protein, based on GenBank Accession No: NM-002295 (p.18, last paragraph). It is noted that a Genbank accession number does not define the protein for use in the claimed method, because the sequence of a particular Genbank accession number is alterable from the original submission.

It is not clear whether the same 67 kDa laminin receptor with the same sequence structure is expressed in the claimed genus of cancer cells, including melanoma cells cited in Umeda et al, lung cancer cells, cited in the specification, liver cancer cells, and breast cancer cells cited in the Declaration of 03/10/09.

The art does not disclose structure of variant 67 kDa laminin receptors.

Although drawn to DNA arts, the findings in University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997) and Enzo Biochem, Inc. V. Gen-Probe Inc. are relevant to the instant claims. The Federal Circuit addressed the application of the written description requirement to DNA-related inventions in University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The court stated that “[a] written description of an invention involving a chemical genus, like a description of a chemical species, requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, [or] chemical name, of the claimed subject matter sufficient to distinguish it from other materials.” Id. At 1567, 43 USPQ2d at 1405. The court also stated that

a generic statement such as “vertebrate insulin cDNA” or “mammalian insulin cDNA” without more, is not an adequate written description of the genus because

it does not distinguish the genus from others, except by function. It does not specifically define any of the genes that fall within its definition. It does not define any structural features commonly possessed by members of the genus that distinguish them from others. One skilled in the art therefore cannot, as one can do with a fully described genus, visualize or recognize the identity of the members of the genus. A definition by function, as we have previously indicated, does not suffice to define the genus because it is only an indication of what the gene does, rather than what it is. Id. At 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406. The court concluded that “naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material.” Id.

Finally, the court addressed the manner by which a genus of cDNAs might be described. “A description of a genus of cDNAs may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of cDNAs, defined by nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus.” Id.

The Federal Circuit has recently clarified that a DNA molecule can be adequately described without disclosing its complete structure. See Enzo Biochem, Inc. V. Gen-Probe Inc., 296 F.3d 1316, 63 USPQ2d 1609 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The Enzo court adopted the standard that the written description requirement can be met by “show[ing] that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics ....i.e., complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics.” Id. At 1324, 63 USPQ2d at 1613 (emphasis omitted, bracketed material in original).

The inventions at issue in Lilly and Enzo were DNA constructs per se, the holdings of those cases are also applicable to claims such as those at issue here. A disclosure that does not

adequately describe a product itself logically cannot adequately describe a method of using that product.

In this case, the specification does not describe the 67 kDa laminin receptor in a manner that satisfies either the standards as shown in the example of Lilly or Enzo. The specification does not provide sufficient structure or common structure to support the broad breath of the claimed genus. Nor is there any functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function. Although the specification discloses a genbank accession number, this does not provide a description of the 67 kDa laminin receptor, that would satisfy the standard as shown in the example of Enzo.

The specification also fails to describe the 67 kDa laminin receptor, by the standards shown in the example in Lilly. It fails to describe a “representative number” of such species. In addition, the specification also does not describe “structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus.”

The specification does not provide an adequate written description of the 67 kDa laminin receptor, that is required to practice the claimed invention. Thus, the specification does not meet the 112, first paragraph written description requirement, and one of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that Applicant did not have possession of the claimed 67 kDa laminin receptor at the time the invention was made. Since the specification fails to adequately describe the product for use in the claimed method, it also fails to adequately describe the claimed method.

***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH-TAM DAVIS whose telephone number is 571-272-0830. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, LARRY HELMS can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MINH TAM DAVIS  
April 09, 2009

/Larry R. Helms/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1643